

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 12 and 13 have been amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 29-42 have been added. Claims 1-11 and 14-28 have been cancelled without any prejudice.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS:

In the Office Action, at page 8, numbered paragraph 2, claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Each of claims 12 and 13 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection to claims 12 and 13 is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-11 AND 14-28 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e):

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 1, claims 1-11 and 14-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Barts et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0082893). Claims 1-11 and 14-28 have been cancelled without any prejudice; therefore, reconsideration of these claims is not requested.

NEWLY ADDED CLAIMS 29-42:

Each of the newly added claims 29-42 patentably distinguishes over Barts et al. and is supported by the originally filed specification.

Independent claim 29 relates to a vehicle information providing apparatus, including: "an image providing function for providing the user terminal with an image data representing the vehicle which is under manufacturing, if the authentication by said authentication function succeeds." This feature is neither taught nor suggested by the reference relied upon.

Independent claim 32 relates to a vehicle information providing apparatus, including: "an image providing function for informing the user terminal of a scheduled manufacturing time and for providing a real-time image data representing the vehicle which is being manufactured, if the

authentication by said authentication function succeeds in the scheduled manufacturing time.” This feature is neither taught nor suggested by the reference relied upon.

Independent claim 33 relates to a vehicle information providing apparatus, including: “an image providing function for providing the user terminal with an image data representing the vehicle which is under manufacturing by the manufacturing machine based on the instruction.” This feature is neither taught nor suggested by the reference relied upon.

Independent claim 34 relates to a vehicle information providing apparatus, including: “means for providing the user terminal with an image data representing the vehicle being manufactured if access to the vehicle information is authenticated, wherein the image data allows a user to monitor the vehicle being manufactured.” This feature is neither taught nor suggested by the reference relied upon.

Independent claim 37 relates to a method of providing vehicle information to a user to monitor conditions of a selected vehicle, including: “providing the user terminal with an image data of the vehicle being manufactured if user access to the vehicle information is authenticated.” This feature is neither taught nor suggested by the reference relied upon.

Independent claim 40 relates to a computer program having: “an image providing function for providing the user terminal with an image data representing the vehicle which is under manufacturing, if the authentication by said authentication function succeeds.” This feature is neither taught nor suggested by the reference relied upon.

Claims 30-31 are dependent upon independent claim 29, claims 35-36 are dependent upon independent claim 34, claims 38-39 are dependent upon independent claim 37, and claims 41-42 are dependent upon independent claim 40.

Approval of the newly added claims 29-42 is respectfully requested for at least the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 7, 2004

By: 

Derek A. Auito
Registration No. 52,576

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501